

**DISTRICT ADVISORY BOARD (DAB) I  
MEETING MINUTES**

**Monday, August 7, 2006**

**7:00 p.m.**

**Atwater Community Center, 2755 E. 19<sup>th</sup>, Wichita, Kansas 67214**

**Members Present**

Council Member Carl Brewer  
Treatha Brown-Foster  
Gerald Domitrovic  
Shane Dundas  
Debra K. Miller Stevens  
Janice Rich\*  
Inga Taylor  
Shontina Tipton  
LaVonta Williams

**Members Absent**

Steve Roberts

**Guests**

Glen Dey, 4515 Greenbriar  
Beverly Domitrovic, 1219 George Washington Blvd  
Shirley A. Benton Kelley, 1628 N. Erie  
Louta Fowler, 1748 N. Kansas  
Ireta Thomas, 1916/1917 Looman  
Nancy Boewe, 3127 Aloma  
Lawrence Risedell, 2649 N. Poplar  
Nellie Walker, 3116 Maplewood  
Drucilla Triplett, 1601 N. Estelle  
Ramona Simms-Henry, 2807 E. 22<sup>nd</sup>  
Don Samuel, 1930 South Madison  
Pat Regan, 7701 E. Kellogg, Suite 850  
James Barfield  
Serena Pedman, 1626 North Gentry  
Chester Selmon, 1710 Sunnybrook Drive  
Willie Burton, 2356 North Poplar  
Lawrence Kirkdale, 2649 North Poplar  
James Roseboro, 4518 Greenbriar  
Rickie Coleman, Sunflower

**\*Alternates**

**City of Wichita Staff Present**

Virdena Gilkey, Neighborhood Assistant  
Mark Stanberry, Housing  
Chief Norman Williams, WPD

**Order of Business**

**Call to Order**

**Council Member Carl Brewer** called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m. and welcomed the guests. He stated that the agenda is lengthy and asked that comments be limited to two minutes. He asked that comments be directed to the District Advisory Board and that each speaker state their name and address for the minutes. Lastly, that no applause be given after each comment.

**Approval of Minutes**

**Roberts (Miller)** made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Motion carried 7-0.

**Approval of Agenda**

**Council Member Brewer** stated that the agenda format would change slightly: Item 4 – Ralph Wultz Tennis Center, Item 5 – Rodeo, Item 6 – Housing, Item 7 – Police Budget, and Item 8 – Updates. **Brown Foster (Williams)** made a motion to approve the as amended. Motion carried 6-0.

**Public Agenda**

**1. District 1 Neighborhood Award**

**City Council Member Carl Brewer** commented that beautification and quality of life is directly related to housing stock. He commented that the Beat 44 area has within it homes that are to be commended due to the upkeep of the owners. The Good Neighbor Program is designed to do just that with city staff at Atwater leading the way. He then presented the *Neighborhood Pride Award* to Ms. Theola Cooper, Mr. and Mrs. Wilbur Washington, and Ms. Nellie Walker for exceptional

maintenance of their property in the 44 Beat area of District 1. This award honors exemplary homeowners and landlords who are “Good Neighbors” in the District 1 community.

**Recommended Action: The honorees received the award for being Good Neighbors.**

### **Off Agenda Items**

No items were submitted.

### **New Business**

### **Staff Reports**

#### **2. Police Report**

**Officer Doug Gerdes** provided information on the following: 1) 43 Beat has lots of juvenile crimes occurring: 12 arrests of youth (working with parents in the 500 – 600 blocks of Volutsia); 2) Sunday, October 1<sup>st</sup> is the Rolling Stones Concert at WSU and they are working on traffic issues related to street parking; 3) Working with owners of Ken Mar Shopping Center on 13<sup>th</sup> Street on problems with parking lot loitering on Saturday nights; 4) property at 3900 E. 13<sup>th</sup> Street has a new owner. Club Vision has a problem with teens. WPD is working with the new owners on curfew violations; and 5) 44 Beat survey results are complete.

**Dundas** arrived at 7:15 p.m.

*(Officer Gerdes response is in italics)*

**Brown Foster** inquired about the twelve youth arrested. *The arrests resulted from the kids disturbing the peace.* **Tipton** asked what are the new owners of Club Vision doing to correct previous issues and what are the hours of operations? *We are working with the tenants on not establishing a juvenile club like in the past. The hours extend from 6:00 p.m - 2:00 a.m.* **Williams** asked where are the owners in trying to obtain a liquor license? *They have not received a license as of yet.*

**Williams (Brown Foster)** made a motion to receive and file. Motion carried 7-0.

#### **3. Ralph Waltz Riverside Tennis Center**

**Larry Foos, Park & Recreation**, presented information on the proposed dome for the Riverside Tennis Court. He reported the following: there would be changes to the courts with replacements from four courts to three, the YMCA submitted a proposal for an after-school program, the board of MCB Wichita stated that funding has been earmarked for the Riverside Tennis Court, city currently does not have an indoor facility, tennis center improvements would include climate control, lighting, and fencing inside the dome, and the lifespan would be 25 years with utility cost estimated at \$29,400. Lastly, although the courts would be reduced from 14 to 13, the benefit is program expansion in an indoor, climate-controlled environment. The Park Board recommends that the City Council use Federal and CIP funds earmarked for this project.

*(Mr. Foos' response is in italics)*

**Williams** asked if the HUD money would be lost? *Yes, if not used by September 30<sup>th</sup>.* **Domitrovic** asked what are the plans for the \$400,000 if we don't use it for this project? *That is at the discretion of the City Council.* **Brown Foster** stated that there is a lot of fencing and lighting issues and asked if the parks would still receive their fair share? *The routine maintenance would be about \$1,000 per*

year. *We don't have plans to take away from existing park plans.* **Brown Foster** add that she would like to know why Dr. Dey, District 1 Park Board representative, voted not to include the dome. **Dr. Glen Dey, 4515 Greenbriar**, responded that there are a number of these domes in communities, but they only operate four months out of the year. Winter heating cost are as high as \$60,000 to \$90,000 per year, which is not cost effective. That was my main concern about the domes. There is a shortage on renovation funds. My recommendation is to resurface the courts, enhance lighting, and dress up the center itself. If the dome were in place, three courts would not be available to be utilized due to rules using outdoor courts. He stated that he is not against the idea, but felt like an alternate plan was needed. **Thompson** asked if the dome could be used in other areas? *Yes. Riverside would be the premiere facility for this use, however, other areas could use the dome with the proper anchors installed.* **Williams** asked what is the amount of usage now? *There were over 10,000 participants last year.* **Rich** asked if there was any research on how much the court would be used with reports that the tennis facility decreased by 42%? *Our local numbers were up from last year and are not decreasing any more. Without personalities to capture the public, it is difficult to determine usage.* There was additional discussion on the funding discrepancies for monthly utility cost and transportation to the tennis center for inner city kids. **Dundas** asked if this court is located in District 6 or District 1? *District 6.* **Council Member Brewer** asked if anyone from the public would like to speak on this matter.

**Willie Burton, 2356 North Poplar**, commented that he objected to the project. He stated that our kids are bused enough and with the cost of fuel so high, there are plenty of uses for HUD money in our area and for our parks. **Brewer** asked if this funding could be used elsewhere? *The grant is allocated for the downtown area only.* **Chester Selmon, 1710 Sunnybrook Drive**, asked if this money would be available without the disadvantaged kids? *Yes.*

**Council Member Brewer** brought the discussion back to the board. He stated the City Council had asked that this item be taken to Districts 1, 2, and 6 for comments. The \$400,000 grant is specifically for the downtown area and will include inner city youth in programming. That is not a requirement, but would provide additional opportunities for our young people.

**Thompson (Williams)** made a motion to approve the purchase of the dome. Motion carried 5-2 (**Domitrovic and Miller-Stevens** opposed).

#### 4. Proposed Rodeo Regulations

**Kurt Schroeder, OCI**, presented information on the Rodeo Moratorium as proposed by the assigned task team. Currently, "Rodeos" are not specifically defined in either the Wichita-Sedgwick County Unified Zoning Code (UZC) or the City license regulation for rodeos. Per UZC classifications, outdoor rodeos would qualify as "Recreation and Entertainment, Outdoor" or as "Riding Academy and Stables". The Task Team presented three alternative courses of action, including: (1) a total ban on all rodeos, outdoor and indoor; (2) new licensing and UZC regulation to allow indoor rodeos or rodeo events only; or (3) new licensing and UZC regulation to allow both indoor and outdoor rodeos or rodeo events. It was noted in the presentation that all alternatives could legally include specific exemptions to allow rodeos or rodeo events at specific venues or properties (i.e., the downtown arena, Old Cowtown, or City or County-owned lands). He stated that the City Council would like to legally consider a total ban.

*(Mr. Schroeder's response is in italics)*

**Miller-Stevens** asked if the county has regulations? *They do not.* **Domitrovic** commented that there have been complaints in previous years concerning rodeos. He asked what is the hard fast rule? Would all rodeos be made to run indoors? *The complaints have been in relation to those who are locally run. The complaints are associated with noise and how late they run. We have not had a*

*national rodeo here in a long time. Dundas asked where we would house an indoor rodeo? There is a big facility called In Cahoots with 30,000 to 40,000 square feet. The only place that has held them is the coliseum, which was designed for this type of event. The downtown arena could be used for this type of event as well. Brewer commented that there are concerns about the band. The council is looking at noise control and animal treatment issues associated with rodeos. In their minds, they believed that rodeos would be allowed in the area; however, they were told that the coliseum would not support asking for an indoor rodeo. The Pro-Rodeo Association is concerned about the band and wants to meet with the city council on the matter. Miller Stevens commented that there is a sheet on proposed rodeo definitions. She asked what is the difference between rodeo and a special event? We have worked for about a year to distinguish special events.*

**Nancy Boewe, 3127 Aloma**, asked if this would be a paid permit event or would it fall within licensing? *If banned, there would be no rodeos. If not, the event would have to have approved licensing.*

**Dundas** suggested that the City Council could set up priorities or criteria for special event. *The rules are not defined yet. The event would have to be licensed and properly zones to be approved.*

**Domitrovic (Williams)** moved to allow Option 2 for new licensing and UZC regulations to allow indoor rodeos or rodeo events only.

Discussion: **Miller Stevens** asked if this recommendation includes exceptions or would it be strictly indoors only? *If approved by the City Council, that would be up to their discretion. Brown Foster asked if the county generally took care of rodeos? Yes, that is correct. Big sanctioned events go to the coliseum. Dundas commented that our city council should set guidelines and establish criteria.*

The motion failed 3-4 (**Brown Foster, Miller Stevens, Dundas, and Thompson** opposed)

**5. Request for Resolution of Support for Application for Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (Conquest North)**

**Mark Stanberry, Housing and Community Services**, presented a request from MPI Kansas, LLC, (MPI) for a City Council resolution of support for its application for Low-Income Housing Tax Credits. MPI proposes to acquire a site located on 27<sup>th</sup> Street North, west of Hillside, east of Grove, and south of the Grove Park area, and construct 36 four-bedroom, two-bathroom single-family homes. The site includes a private roadway that has already been constructed.

**Pat Regan, 7701 E. Kellogg, Suite 850**, reported that he is the consultant from MPI Kansas and showed an aerial map of the property. Mr. Regan stated the following: the private streets were inherited and Public Works dictates use of the streets, tax credits allow the correction of infrastructure issues, the houses are all built to Fair Housing standards, all homes are electric and equipped with appliances including a washer and dryer, screening process in place for occupation, community room with Internet access, small playground, area for WPD, all rooms are wired for high speed access, no side load garages in the area, almost 1400 square feet, and monthly rent is \$600 per month. Houses will sell for \$120,000 with the biggest obstacle being qualification.

Mr. Regan added that he does not feel this project to be inconsistent with the Central Northeast Area Plan as stated by MAPC. They are complying with the 15-year stipulation in order to meet tax credit requirements. The plan is to attract families into the area that will remain for the long-term. He asked that the board reject the City's recommendation and vote to approve this resolution.

*(Mr. Regan's response is in italics)*

**Miller Stevens** asked if the first 15 years would be all rentals and if the project would go forward without tax credits? *36 of the 58 homes would be rentals.* **Brown Foster** stated that where they want to build is a park. She asked how they received private streets? *The private streets were in place before the purchase of the land. With the proposed maintenance funds, the streets would be maintained. This is similar to Beacon Hills where there are private streets. The quality of the project depends on the tax credits. Without the tax credit the developer will make that decision.* **Williams** asked if the Environmental Assessment was complete? *Phase 1 of the assessment has been done, which was a soil test. The tax credit provides the cubic feet below the surface.* **Tipton** asked if the \$1,000 assessed to the homeowners apply to the renters as well? *Renters pay indirectly vis-à-vis rent.* **Miller Stevens** asked about the \$58,000 assessment for the roads and what is covered? *\$37,000 alone is for the roads. The cap is \$58,000 to add new curbs and gutters and the addition of one fire hydrant.* **Thompson** commented that on their website is different sets of homes that are spaced apart. *MPI develops many residences and none of their lots are in the city. The lots are longer than they are wide.* **Dundas** stated that low-income houses in not low-income for a price of \$120,000. He added that the homes seem small for that much money. *The homes were never marketed as low income. Owners must qualify with 60% of their average income. We are not seeking low-income tenants for the homes. Entry-level homes are 1100 square feet and these homes are larger. The issue of targeting low-income levels comes from the State of Kansas. Six people in a house could have an income of \$48,000 – that's not low. They cannot have more than the allowable income.*

*(The discussion was extended to the public for comment)*

**Dorothy Nave, 1802 Looman**, stated that her association has been talking with Pat and HUD dictates him to. They cannot do basements because of the bricks and debris embedded in the dirt. Pat wants good neighbors to go along side already good neighbors. Houses are being improved tremendously. We are looking forward to new homes as homeowners make good neighbors. **James Barfield** stated that he would like to see this area updated. The average person is not going to spend that kind of money for homes with no basement. People who can purchase these homes could move into another area. He is setting himself up for failure. Why purchase houses on slabs when you have mobile homes? *Beacon Hill homes are on slabs.* **Iretta Thomas, 1917 Looman** asked for a definition of single-family homes. *A building that houses one family.* **Willie Burton, 2356 North Poplar**, asked if there would be a hard rain, would the streets hold the water? *Yes, according to the City of Wichita.* **Lawrence Kirkdale, 2649 North Poplar**, commented that the area smells like manure. He added that building homes on slabs is not wise, as the walls will eventually crack as the land gives. The houses are too close together, which could create an old Prim Rose housing establishment. **Don Samuel, 1930 South Madison**, commented that 1400 square feet of living space and using 60% medium income for a family of six is targeting low-income. **Dr. Glen Dey, 4515 Greenbriar**, commented that in looking at the framework of the Central Northeast Area Plan, his initial hopes was to bring in high-end housing to free up middle class type housing in that area. He stated that it is important to have neighbors examine their needs and this project does not appear to have enough money to develop suburban housing stock. The drainage structure on the photos gives a questionable impression of how it will last. **James Roseboro, 4518 Greenbriar**, asked if the public could be assured that the houses would not be built on contaminated slab? *Mark Stanberry replied that there was no environmental assessment.* Roseboro added that there was a major sewer breakdown last year. The storm water must go some place and it looks like Grove Park would be the dumping ground. *Mr. Stanberry replied that as far as the drainage is concerned, retention ponds would be required when water is not drained fast enough. Mr. Regan added that MAPC has already gone over all of that. It was a nine-month process. As a developer, engineering requirements must be abided by. Lots of people review these plans as they are based on a City-based plat.* **Romona Simms Henry, 2807 East 22<sup>nd</sup> Street**, asked if there would be a play area for the kids? *Yes, we will build a play area near 25<sup>th</sup> Street.* **Dundas** asked would the area need rezoning? *No, zoning requirements took place under the previous owner.*

**Brown Foster (Domitrovic)** moved to approve the tax credit resolution for Conquest. Motion failed 2-5 (**Miller Stevens, Tipton, Williams, Thompson, and Dundas** opposed).

**6. Police Department Budget**

**Chief Norman Williams, Wichita Police Department**, presented the Police Department's 2007 Budget and In-car video information summary. Based on the Safe and Secure goals and the goal indicators, the Police Department developed and submitted a priority needs list designed to accomplish the goals. The 2007/2008 budgets totaled \$2,557,378. The City Manager's Proposed Budget 2007/2008 allocated \$616,928. Chief Williams further stated that the projected expenses associated with purchasing and implementing the In-Car Video Pilot Program ranged from a high of \$232,936.00 to a low of \$163,805.00. This includes equipment as well as salaries. The projected on-going annual expenses totaled \$91,985.00 for one Bureau and \$131,596 for four Bureaus. He further stated that the proposed budget amount does not include funding for maintenance and replacement items.

Chief Williams also reported that a study was conducted that revealed 70% of the police officers' activities would be out of the view of the in-car video system. Out of the 133,000 police reports, 93,100 report-generating incidents are out of the view of the in-car video system. Additionally, in 2005 Wichita Police Officers issued 71,600 moving citations and investigated 85 complaints related to those citations, which accounts for about 0.001% of the total citations issued by police officers. Additional officers, detectives, etc are needed. 90% of the police budget is personnel with 10% remaining for operations. He ended by stating that the in-car video is a good addition to the police department only if the needs of the department have been met. They did not ask for extravagant things and did not receive all that he asked for. However, he is appreciative for what they did receive.

There was citizen input that addressed the following: 1) Sunflower Community Action was asked address this issue to ensure safety, respect, and accountability. The in-car cameras would eliminate the "he said she said" scenario; 2) a local vendor believes that the police department's numbers are inflated. A 20 car pilot program was located that would charge only \$150,000 for the system, which is a huge cost savings to the City. This system programs digitally without manual loading; 3) Sunflower has 3,000 signatures and another 4,000 forthcoming to support this project; 4) this is not a District 1 issue but a citywide issue and the entire City Council should support this. Money should come out of the General Fund; 5) the cameras would be an asset to WPD and the citizens; 6) Channel 10 and Channel 12 would not be asked to perform their jobs without the use of cameras. We cannot afford to not have cameras in police cars. The cameras would prove who is lying and who is telling the truth. It is mind boggling that this is not a priority; 7) the City Council held a discussion in workshop to consider having cameras in their workshops, which was estimated to cost \$50,000. Council Member Martz was quoted saying he is not concerned with whether or not cameras are there, as he behaves ethically. That should be the same for the police officers. The pilot program for only 10 cars is set up to fail and is not cost effective; 8) The city is willing to pay \$10 million to keep the Wranglers in our town, but continues to say there is no money for cameras. This should not come out of the District 1 budget, but the entire city should support this project; 9) the Schweiter neighborhood was just awarded funding that was requested six years ago to have the park updated. The tennis and basketball courts have huge cracks in them that need repairing. The playground was installed in 2002; however, the rumor mill says that Schweiter Park will possibly lose funding due to a request to use allocated funding to pay for the cameras. The neighborhood association has worked the City's process for six years and to lose that funding is not fair; 10) cost savings alone for lawsuits should be a factor for the cameras. The City just paid out \$5 million because they did not have a camera in the car. That money would have paid for cameras for the entire region; 11) the cameras would be nice but there is strong objection to taking funding from park and street repairs; 12) Congressman Tiahart has agreed to fund the cameras if we can show support from the Mayor and City Council. Federal

funding is available; and 13) at the corner of McLean and Central, the City paid \$300,000 for lights that do not benefit anyone.

**Serena Pedman, 1626 North Gentry**, brought up another issue. Ms. Pedman described an incident where her son was beaten and she and her daughter were maced by WPD. It was said that an officer “accidentally kicked her son in the head” and with 27 officers present, no one could identify which officer committed the offense. She said that a camera would have identified the officer. The City received grants for Tasers, get a grant for the cameras. School buses have cameras to record incidents, why can’t the city do the same? State funding could be obtained if the city would grant a letter of support for the cameras.

Board member, **Gerald Domitrovic**, stated that he had heard the rumor that if the board votes for the cameras, the park funding would be lost. **Council Member Brewer** responded that he is looking for ways to see what program allocations could be readjusted for another year due to the request for cameras. The two park items and the one street item was a consideration.

Board members asked the following questions: 1) is the Sunflower group going to other DABs to address this issue?; 2) has the Sunflower group considered fundraising efforts to pay for the cameras? **Rickie Coleman, Sunflower Community Action President**, responded that Council Member Brewer was the only City Council member that offered to assist with securing the cameras. She added that they are not asking for the funding to come from District 1 projects, but that this is a citywide effort. It is their desire that cameras be located in each bureau. There have been no efforts to raise money for the cameras other than approaching Congressman Tiahart.

The consensus of the board was that they are not against cameras in the police cars, but they would not support the removal of funding allocations from currently funded projects. Every group must follow the budget process to obtain funding. It was also a consensus of the board that this not be a District 1 issue and that other District Advisory Boards and City Council members be approached with this issue. It was suggested by two board members that Sunflower Community Action or city staff research how other cities have funded cameras in cars and also provide factual information regarding the cost savings associated with lawsuits if the cameras are installed. The reason for the last request was the statistics that showed 70% of what the police do would not be witnessed on the cameras. Lastly, it was suggested that lapel cameras be considered as an alternative in order to capture video from domestic violence and foot chase arrests.

One board member stated that there are not enough officers on the streets and domestic violence cases need police right away. He said we have to set priorities and encouraged Sunflower to raise the money and donate the cameras if that is a high priority for them. Further stated was citizens do not want to raise taxes. Having cameras in five cars in each bureau is not enough to spend that kind of money when we do not have enough officers.

**Chief Williams** asked to address the federal funding statements. He stated that post 9-11 federal dollars have diminished from \$4.7 billion in 2004 to \$1.5 billion in 2007 for law enforcement efforts. President Bush is now funding Homeland Security and local law enforcement agencies are not getting that money. The Wichita Police Department has had to bypass equipment that would have been purchased in the past. Further, the Law Enforcement grant is going away. It is a myth that federal money is out there, because the focus has shifted and there are not a lot of federal dollars available.

**J. J. Selmon, Sunflower**, responded that they were told by James Richardson, in Tihart’s office, that possible funding may be available in September 2007. However, they cannot obtain those funds

without the City's support. He added that the \$5 million settlement to Max Clay came out of tax dollars that may not have been paid out if the cameras were there.

**Thompson** moved that the pilot program for police cars be denied. That motion died due to the lack of a second.

Substitute motion: **Brown Foster (Tipton)** moved for Council Member Brewer to speak to the City Council Members concerning financing for cameras with the understanding that funds are not removed from current District 1 projects or the Wichita Police Department Budget. The motion passed 5-2 (**Dundas, and Thompson** opposed).

### **Unfinished Business**

No items submitted.

### **Board Agenda**

#### **7. Updates, Issues, and Reports**

- **Brewer** reported that the District 1 Coalition Breakfast was good and long. The next breakfast will be held September 9<sup>th</sup> with Kay Johnson as the guest speaker.
- **Gilkey** reported the Beat 44 Neighborhood Cleanup to take place on Saturday, August 12<sup>th</sup>. She asked for volunteers.
- **Brown Foster** announced the Northeast Millair NA Cleanup on August 19<sup>th</sup>.

With no further business, **Thompson (Roberts)** recommended adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 11:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Virdena Gilkey  
Neighborhood Assistant